



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

GENERAL INQUIRY
07/302,832 01/27/89 KATSURA
K 50026767X06

ANTONELLI, TERRY & WANDS
STE. 600, 1919 PENN. AVE., N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

HERNDON, H

12/12/89

- ☒ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 1-27-89 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 3 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-7 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☒ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit: 237

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on an application filed in Japan on April 18, 1988. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119.

3. The Information submitted under 37 CFR 1.56(a) has been considered to the examiner's best understanding, however the applicants are requested to file an English translation of each reference for further consideration. Furthermore the applicants are requested to supply the Inventors names for these references.

It has also been noted that the applicants have requested a corrected Filing Receipt indicating the correct number of claims to be 36, however there are presently only 7 claims pending in the application.

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format of an Abstract of the Disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said", should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 231

In particular "Disclosed is here" is considered to be legal phraseology. Also note that the entire specification should be carefully checked to insure compliance with 37 CFR 1.52 (a and b). (For example, on page 1, line 4, "an in particular" is grammatically incorrect).

Also each acronym must be fully defined at their first instance in the abstract, specification and claims. (For example on page 4, line 21, "CRT" and line 24, "DAC".)

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 2, the memory means is recited "having an m-bit data bus". Is this data bus within the memory or merely connecting the memory to other structural elements? In lines 5-7 it is also unclear where the n-bit data bus is located. Also in line 7, what is meant by "execute a data processing"? In lines 8-11 the store means is considered to be unclear. How does the store means relate to the memory means? Are they the same? Where are the data items read out from? This element is not structurally connected to any other element of the claim. In line 13, "so as to be" is considered to be awkward language.

Art Unit: 231

similarly rejected. The applicants are requested to carefully consider what the novel feature(s) of their invention is and restructure the claim language to distinctly recite the elements and their structural interconnections.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.

7. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Pinkham.

Serial No: 302332

-5-

Art Unit: 231

of the invention appears to be a graphics processor control system which includes a memory which has parallel addressable locations which is then serially loaded into a temporary storage. The patent to Pinkham discloses such a parallel/serial system including memory arrays. Since there are no recited structural interconnections of the recited elements (see above) the system disclosed by Pinkham is considered to be equivalent.

8. The applicants response to this action should place the application in condition for final disposal.

9. No claim are allowed.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. R. Herndon whose telephone number is (703) 557-4920.

Any inquiry of a general nature, or relating to the status of this application, should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 557-2878.

HRH/jrm
12/08/89

Heather R. Herndon
HEATHER R. HERNDON
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 231